

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 15 2007

Ser. No. 10/088,622  
Internal Docket No. PF990063

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1 and 6-11 are pending. Claims 1 and 6-11 stand rejected.  
Claims 1 and 9 have been amended more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. No new matter is entered.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended herein to delete the phrase "all devices." In view of the amendment, it is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lintulampi (US 6,377,804) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 5,377,267) (hereinafter Suzuki) and D'Amico et al. (previously cited) (hereinafter D'Amico).

The Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the following reasons, present claims 1 and 6-11 are patentable distinguishable over the suggested combination of references.

Applicants' claim 1 recites: "asking a user, through a user interface, whether the user wants to install a new network or install said device on an existing network."

The Office Action points to lines 6-14 and 42-55 (the column is not indicated) of Lintulampi to show this feature. However, nowhere does Lintulampi describe or even suggest asking a user whether the user wants to install a new network or install the device on an existing network. Lintulampi is concerned with registering a mobile station on a network. For example, if a mobile moves outside a UMTS network coverage area to a GSM area.

Switching from a UMTS to GSM or visa versa is not equivalent to the claimed install a new network or install the device on an existing network. Lintulampi only describes registering a mobile on a different, pre-existing network. Registering a mobile station to another network during roaming is not equivalent to installing a new network. Furthermore, even assuming arguendo, that switching from a UMTS to a GSM is "installing a new network," nowhere does Lintulampi teach or suggest asking a user, through a user interface, whether the user wants to register with the GSM network. Claim 1 recites "asking a user, through a user interface," Lintulampi does not suggest at least these features of claim 1.

Ser. No. 10/088,622  
Internal Docket No. PF990063

In addition, the Office Action admits Lintulampi fails to describe asking the user to enter a pin code. The Office Action points to Suzuki. However, nowhere is there any, such suggestion of the claimed "asking a user to enter a pin code in Suzuki." In fact Suzuki clearly states that the unique identifier is **assigned in advance by the service provider**. Thus Suzuki fails to teach the features asserted in the Office Action as being shown in Suzuki.

Also, the Office Action does not even address the claimed feature (d), namely, the device becoming the central controller of the new network. Clearly the mobile station, in the combination of references, does not become the central controller in either the UMTS or GSM networks.

Likewise, D'Amico does not suggest the features asserted in the Office Action as being shown. Nor does D'Amico cure the defects of the Suzuki and Lintulampi. None of the references relate to creating a new network. That is, "install a new network" does not have the same meaning in the combination of references. In the combination of references the only teaching is registering the device to another pre-existing network. There is nothing in the references concerning creating a new network as described in the present application, for example, on page 5, line 35 – page 6, line 17.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the suggested combination of reference fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of applicants' claim 1. Therefore a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established. Independent claim 9, although different from claim 1, includes features similar to the ones discussed above distinguishing claim 1 from the combination of references. Therefore, claim 9 is likewise patentably distinguished from the suggested combination of cited references for at least the same reasons as those applied to claim 1.

The respective dependent claims are likewise patentable since each includes at least the distinguishing features discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional features not found in the cited combination of references.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however,

Ser. No. 10/088,622  
Internal Docket No. PF990063

the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alain Durand, et al.



By: Paul P. Kiel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC  
P.O. Box 5312  
2 Independence Way  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: August 15, 2007